

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/709,975	06/10/2004	Ron M. Bean	04B1727	3974	
24234 SIMMONS PE	7590 01/30/2008		EXAM	INER	
SIMMONS PERRINE PLC THIRD FLOOR TOWER PLACE			CEGIELNIK, URSZULA M		
22 SOUTH LINN STREET IOWA CITY, IA 52240			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,		•	3711		
				DEL WEDV MODE	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			01/30/2008	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•		Application No.	Applicant(s)	
j.		10/709,975	BEAN, RON M.	
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
		Urszula M. Cegielnik	3711	
Por	The MAILING DATE of this communication a iod for Reply	appears on the cover sheet wit	h the correspondence address	
	A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REF THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a r - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perions - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by stat - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the ma earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	N. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a re reply within the statutory minimum of thirty od will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONT tute, cause the application to become ABA	ply be timely filed  (30) days will be considered timely.  HS from the mailing date of this communication.  ANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Stat	tus			
	1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19	November 2007.		
2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	his action is non-final.		
	3) Since this application is in condition for allow	vance except for formal matte	ers, prosecution as to the merits is	
	closed in accordance with the practice unde	r <i>Ex par</i> te Quayle, 1935 C.D.	11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Dis	position of Claims		•	
	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11-28</u> is/are pending in the applicat	tion.		
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd			
	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>11-28</u> is/are rejected.			
	7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.		
App	olication Papers			
	9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.		
1	0) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) a	ccepted or b) ☐ objected to b	y the Examiner.	
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	he drawing(s) be held in abeyand	ce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ection is required if the drawing(	s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)	).
1	1) $\square$ The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached	Office Action or form PTO-152.	
Pric	ority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
1	<ul> <li>2) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority docume</li> </ul>		119(a)-(d) or (f).	
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume		onlication No	
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the pr	·	·	
	application from the International Bure			
	* See the attached detailed Office action for a li		eceived.	
		·		
_	chment(s)	· 		
	Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		ummary (PTO-413)	
2) L 3) [	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		/Mail Date formal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
-, _	Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:		

Application/Control Number: 10/709,975

Art Unit: 3711

## **DETAILED ACTION**

The finality of the Office action dated 18 May 2007 has been withdrawn, and prosecution has been reopened.

## **Double Patenting**

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 11-28 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of non-statutory double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of US Patent No. 6,752,681.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct fro each other because they set forth subject matters which are obvious over each other and only differ in breadth of terminology used. For example, the limitation "sounding board" in claims 11-28 of the application is an obvious variation in meaning of the limitation "airflow tube" in patent claims 2-4 because "sounding board" and "sound chamber" are

Application/Control Number: 10/709,975

Art Unit: 3711

disclosed as being the same feature. Furthermore, both sets of claims recite a housing; a reed; a pressure point structure; a rigid cylindrical member.

## Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Urszula M. Cegielnik whose telephone number is 571-272-4420. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, from 5:45AM-2:15PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Eugene L. Kim can be reached on 571-272-4463. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Some

Page 3

umc

EUGENE KIM SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER